

**REMARKS**

By this amendment, claims 1, 3-5, 7-9, and 11-12 have been amended. New claims 13-19 have been added. Claims 1-19 are pending in the application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the original claims and other claims in this and other applications.

New claims 13-19 find support from the specification and FIGs. 2-4. Applicants believe the new claims are in condition for allowance.

The drawings stand objected to under 37 CFR § 1.83(a) for failing to show every feature of the claims. The specification and claims 1, 3-5, 7-9, and 11-12 have been amended to better conform with one another and the specification and drawings. No new matter has been added. The specification and claims clarify the output signal provided by the oscillator. Applicants respectfully request that the 37 CFR § 1.83(a) objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

Claims 1-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for the specification not being enabling for an oscillator circuit generating plural signals. Reconsideration is respectfully requested. As noted, claims 1, 3-5, 7-9, and 11-12 have been amended to better conform with the specification and drawings to overcome the concerns raised in the Office Action. No new matter has been added. The claims as amended are believed to be in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Claims 1-3, 5-7, and 9-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Slujis (US 6,437,545). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites, inter alia, “[a] power supply apparatus, comprising ... an oscillator circuit which generates a common oscillator signal; and a controller which

performs a time sharing control based on the oscillator signal.” Slujis does not disclose this limitation. Slujis discloses control means 9, which internally generates duty cycle A, duty cycle B, and duty cycle C. Col. 6, ln. 62-63. There is no common oscillator signal. Since Slujis does not disclose all the limitations of claim 1, claim 1 and dependent claims 2-3 are not anticipated by Slujis. Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Claim 5 recites, *inter alia*, “[a] power supply apparatus, comprising ... [an] oscillating means for generating a common oscillator signal; and [a] controlling means for performing a time sharing control based on the oscillator signal.” As discussed above regarding the patentability of claim 1, Slujis does not disclose this limitation. Slujis does not disclose a common oscillator signal. Since Slujis does not disclose all the limitations of claim 5, claim 5 and dependent claims 6-7 are not anticipated by Slujis. Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Claim 9, as amended, recites, *inter alia*, a power supply apparatus or method comprising “generat[ing] a common oscillator signal; and perform[ing] a time sharing control based on the oscillator signal.” As discussed above regarding the patentability of claim 1, Slujis does not disclose this limitation. Slujis does not disclose a common oscillator signal. Since Slujis does not disclose all the limitations of claim 9, claim 9 and dependent claims 10-11 are not anticipated by Slujis. Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Claims 4, 8, and 12 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. As discussed above regarding the patentability of claim 1, 5, and 9, the base claim is believed to be in condition for allowance, along with its dependent claims.

In view of the above amendment, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: September 23, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Thomas J. D'Amico

Registration No.: 28,371

Rachael Lea Leventhal

Registration No.: 54,266

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &

OSHINSKY LLP

2101 L Street NW

Washington, DC 20037-1526

(202) 785-9700

Attorneys for Applicants